REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on September 29, 2004. Claims 1-11 are rejected. Claims 12-24 have been withdrawn. Claim 9 is canceled. Claim 6 is amended. No new matter has been added.

Affirmation of the Provisional Election

Claims 1-24 were subjected to a restriction. Applicant provisionally elected Group I (claims 1-11) for examination during a telephone conversation with the Examiner on September 20, 2004. The election of Group I (claims 1-11) is affirmed.

Drawings

The Examiner issued objection on the drawings for containing errors. The drawings have so been amended to correct the errors. No new matter is added by the Amendment.

Title

The title has been amended as indicated above per the Examiner's advice.

Claim Objection

The Examiner has advised that claims 2 and claim 9 are substantial duplicates of one another. Claim 9 is canceled.

Specification

The Examiner has advised the Applicant to check for minor errors in the Specification. The Examiner has also suggested some minor typo corrections and insertions of U.S. Patent Numbers that have been issued for several cited U.S. Patent Application. The Specification has so been corrected. No new matter is added by this amendment.

It is to be noted that the Examiner indicated an error to be found in paragraph [0091]. However, the error is actually in paragraph [0092]. Applicant believes that the Examiner misstated the paragraph number.

35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 6 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention for lacking antecedent to the term "the plurality of display drivers coupled to a first substrate." Claim 6 has been amended to correct the lack of antecedent as indicated above.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 6-7 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Haas, (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,555, hereinafter "Haas").

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Haas could have not anticipated claims 1, 3, 6-7 and 10-11 since Haas did not teach, disclose, or even suggest each and every element of the claims. In particular, Haas did not describe "an array of display drivers, each formed from a first substrate and deposited and recessed onto a second substrate, each of said display drivers converting a first voltage from said first voltage driver to a second voltage," (emphasis added).

As can be understood from Figures 1-2, Haas pertained to a plasma display that includes a back substrate 24 that includes discharge troughs 38 and barrier ribs 40. Electrodes 42 are formed in the troughs 38. Hass' plasma display further includes front substrate 22 that includes electrodes 30. The front substrate 22 and the back substrate 24 are coupled and the electrodes 30 and electrodes 42 cross to form pixels 46.

However, Haas did not teach, disclose, or even suggest any driver that is formed

from a first substrate and then deposited onto a second substrate as recited in the claims. More important, Haas did not teach, disclose, or even suggest that any of the substrates include recessed regions where the display drivers are to be deposited into. As recited in the claims, the drivers are deposited and recessed onto a second substrate. Therefore, Haas could have not anticipated claims 1, 3, 6-7 and 10-11. Applicant thus respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 6-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,345, hereinafter "Choi") in view of Haas.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Choi did teach, disclose, or even suggest each and every element of the claims. Similar to Haas, Choi did not describe "an array of display drivers, each formed from a first substrate and deposited and recessed onto a second substrate, each of said display drivers converting a first voltage from said first voltage driver to a second voltage," (emphasis added).

Choi did not disclose any driver that is formed from a first substrate and then deposited onto a second substrate as recited in the claims. More important, Choi did not disclose that any of the substrates include recessed regions where the display drivers are to be deposited into. As recited in the claims, the drivers are deposited and recessed onto a second substrate.

Similarly, Haas did not disclose a second substrate that includes recessed regions where the display drivers are to be deposited into.

Therefore, combining Haas and Choi could have led to claims 1-2, 6-7 and 9-11.

Applicant thus respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection under Haas and Choi.

Claims 1-2, 6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malhi, (U.S. Patent No. 5,818,165, hereinafter "Malhi") in view of Watkins, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,133,689, hereinafter "Watkins").

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Malhi did not teach, disclose, or suggest an array of display drivers, each formed from a first substrate and deposited and recessed onto a second substrate, each of said display drivers converting a first voltage from said first voltage driver to a second voltage as recited in the claims. Malhi discussed only that

> a plurality of conductors 28 are formed on an interior surface of backing sheet layer 26. The interior surface of backing sheet layer 26 faces the interior surface of anode element 12. Conductors 28 can be structured as two sets of mutually parallel strips that orthogonally intersect. To form conductors 28, a conductive material, such as, for example, niobium (Nb) is deposited on backing sheet layer 26 to form a thin coating that is about 2,000 Å thick. The conductive coating is then photolithographed and etched to produce a conductive mesh structure.

On the other hand, in Applicant's invention as recited in the claims, the display drivers can be formed on blocks that include the necessary electrical and then removed from the first substrate and placed in recesses in the second substrate.

Similarly, Walkin did not teach depositing of display drivers in the second substrate. Thus, even if Walkin teach the first voltage driver limitation as set forth in the claims, Walkin and Malhi together could not lead to the elements of claims 1-2, 6 and 8-11. Applicant thus respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection under Walkin and Malhi.

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malhi, in view of Watkins, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shanks, et al., (U.S. 5,821,688, hereinafter "Shanks").

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As previously discussed, Malhi did not teach, disclose, or suggest an array of display drivers, each formed from a first substrate and deposited and recessed onto a second substrate, each of said display drivers converting a first voltage from said first voltage driver to a second voltage as recited in the claims. Similarly, Walkin did not teach depositing of display drivers in the second substrate. Shanks may have taught forming of a flexible display, but Shanks did not teach that display drivers can be formed from a first substrate and deposited and recessed onto a second substrate. If any, in Shanks, the active components are formed on one substrate as can be understood from Figures 3-5. Malhi, Walkin, and Shanks, in combination or alone could not lead to the elements of claims 4-5. Applicant thus respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection under Malhi, Walkin, and Shanks.

Applicant submits that as discussed above, the pending claims are patentable over the above references.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Mimi Diemmy Dao at (408) 720-8300.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: December 23, 2004

Mimi Diemmy Dao
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,628

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-3476